CPE Campus Visits
Strategic Planning, Key Indicators, and 2020 Projections
Summer 2006

During the months of May and June, the Council's planning and performance unit conducted a series of campus visits with the nine public postsecondary institutions. The purpose of the visits was threefold: 1) to help the Council staff better understand each campus' internal strategic planning process, 2) to explain the 2020 projections model and discuss how institutional key indicator goals relate to these 2020 targets, and 3) to receive feedback from campuses about how the Council can better facilitate progress and move reform forward.

Typically, the visits lasted two to four hours and involved the provosts, enrollment managers, chief budget officers, information and research directors, admission officers, strategic planning directors, and the president and/or president's office staff. The following summarizes these discussions.

Institutional Strategic Plans

Overall, the Council staff observed a great deal of alignment between the Public Agenda for Postsecondary and Adult Education and each institution's strategic plan. Most institutions said they would like to be given an opportunity to revise their Campus Action Plan, but all agreed their university strategic plan will continue to drive activities and decisions on campus. Murray State University has developed a crosswalk to illustrate how each of the university's goals maps to one of the Council's five questions. The Council staff is considering developing a similar crosswalk for each institution, which could supplement or supplant the CAP and better illustrate how each institution is advancing and tracking Public Agenda goals in the Council's annual accountability report and other documents.

The following list summarizes the status of current institutional strategic plans:

Institution	Plan	Status Update
EKU	EKU Strategic Plan (2006-2010)	Recently completed
KCTCS	KCTCS Strategic Plan (2006-2010)	Recently completed
KSU	Undergoing strategic planning process	Final plan expected January 2007
MoSU	Aspiring to Greatness (2006-2010)	Recently completed
MuSU	Murray State Strategic Plan (2003-2008)	Preparing for next plan
NKU	Visions, Values, and Voices (2003-2008)	Preparing for next plan

UK	The Dream and the Challenge (2006-2009)	Under revision; preparing to align with Top 20 Business Plan
UofL	Challenge for Excellence: Full Speed Ahead (1998-2008)	Preparing for next plan
WKU	Challenging the Spirit (2005-2008)	Preparing for next plan

Key Indicators

The Council staff reviewed institutional key indicator data and information with the campuses by presenting a worksheet that outlined historical and benchmark data where applicable. It was discussed that there may be opportunities to provide additional context when reporting data to outside audiences to help explain why numbers may look the way they do. It was important for institutions to have ample time to vet and understand goals moving forward. A master timeline of goal-setting processes will be developed to help better communicate the timing of the Council strategic planning and goal-setting efforts. It was explained that 2008 goals for both state and institution key indicators will be brought to the Council for consideration at its September 18, 2006, meeting.

2020 Projections

The Council staff presented an overview of the 2020 projections study and a first draft of a possible model for producing the 211,000 additional bachelor's degrees needed in Kentucky. It is clear that the pool of potential college students must grow significantly if these projections are met. The biggest change posited in the model is to funnel more first-time students through KCTCS and increase significantly the number of upper-division transfers from KCTCS to the comprehensive universities. There are many questions about how this strategy can be operationalized while maintaining student choice. Campuses felt the Council should focus on the degrees needed at each institution, instead of trying to project enrollments. For example, an institution may decide to enroll fewer students but increase its retention and graduation rates. Campuses want the freedom to configure enrollment differently, as long as degree objectives are met.

Feedback and Suggestions

The Council staff asked a series of questions to learn how the CPE might better serve its institutional constituents. A number of insightful, constructive comments will be explored in the coming months:

Finance/Financial Aid/Tuition Policy
- Advocate for adequate resources for the public postsecondary system to support required growth. Keep messages to the General Assembly simple, understandable, and powerful.
- Create more opportunities for financial aid for nontraditional adults and transfer students.
- Reconsider the issue of tuition parameters and reciprocity for out-of-state students.

- Develop a funding model that recognizes differences needed for strategic investments in public institutions in the Commonwealth.
- Develop a better understanding of cost per degree and cost effectiveness measures.
- Advocate for strategic resources to assist institutions in planning and implementing course redesign and reorganization of curriculum and academic programs to increase productivity and efficiency and possibly reduce need for new capital projects.

Outreach
- Conduct another statewide marketing campaign to help Kentuckians understand the value of a postsecondary degree.
- Explore regional and statewide demand for particular types of degrees in order to discover new pockets of opportunities in the short-term and long-term. For example, many institutions expressed the need to identify working-age adults and determine ways to work with employers to bring them back into the postsecondary system. A number of institutions appear to be exploring ways of providing experiential learning credits to adult learners.
- Work with the Governor and General Assembly to provide a better understanding of how institutions' areas of geographic responsibility work and how institutions collaborate to meet state and regional educational needs.

Information, Reporting, and Planning
- Provide more contextual information when reporting institutional results in the accountability report and other Council documents. For example, provide information about sample size when reporting NSSE survey results and clearly explain how affordability is measured.
- Serve as a clearinghouse for best practices in the nation and state and provide professional development to institutional staff, as needed. For example, for faculty engaged in community work, what kind of research is needed and where can it be published? KYVU could serve as a repository for national and statewide data on distance education. New ways need to be found to allow institutions to learn from one another and take advantage of each other's strengths.
- Remain sensitive to the rhythms of the colleges and universities, especially when trying to align Public Agenda goals and campus strategic plans. Be cognizant of the institution's ongoing SACS cycle of accreditation review and, to the extent possible, minimize data requests during peak times. Create a mechanism or process to ensure CPE numbers and institutional numbers match. Continue to refine key indicator metrics, especially in the areas of teacher quality and transfer. Consider broadening measures for question five to include not just research and commercialization but also workforce development training.
- Facilitate statewide discussions on reporting guidelines for key indicator goals, as needed. There was some concern that institutions are not reporting results uniformly, especially in the area of federal research and development expenditures to NSF.
- Explore additional ways to publicly report and communicate all of the positive things that institutions are doing for the state and their regions and the accountability systems that

have been established to improve performance. Institutions want ways to express the uniqueness of their institutions to the public.

- Continue to aggressively push the Public Agenda, key indicators, and 2020 goals because they allow institutional representatives to use the Council as a lever and advocate for change on campus.
- Work on a long-term plan that communicates the timing of the Council's strategic planning and goal-setting processes in order to facilitate even stronger alignment in the future.
- Continue to develop secure ways for institutions to share information and data.

2020 Projections
- Shift focus from enrollment to degree production when developing 2020 projections. Setting regional enrollment goals might promote better coordination among the two-year, four-year, and independent institutions that are all recruiting the same pool of students.
- Pay more attention to the types of degrees needed to alleviate shortages and fuel Kentucky's economy (in STEM fields, for instance). How can more students be driven to pursue these focus fields? Explore ways to expedite new program approval processes.
- Consider expanding the 2020 educational attainment goal to include associate-level careers with a lifetime earning potential that equals or exceeds many baccalaureate-level fields. These degrees are just as valuable to the state's economic development.
- Reexamine the appropriateness of doctoral-level degrees at the comprehensive universities. There may be areas where the market supports it.
- Become more aggressive at looking for systematic ways to bring alumni who have left the state back to Kentucky.
- Develop a forum for policy debate on major issues related to meeting the 2020 projections (e.g., how will the state be able to help funnel more students through KCTCS? how do we work with K-12 to dramatically increase the number of high school graduates? how do we get more adult students into the postsecondary pipeline?).
- Host statewide conferences or other forums so institutions can discuss issues like enrollment management challenges and systems to reward faculty engagement in strategic planning efforts (e.g., regional stewardship activities).

Transfers
- Work with KCTCS to provide four-year institutions with contact information for potential transfer students earlier in the process. Better coordination between the two-year and four-year institutions is needed to ensure students do not enter the university with excessive credit hours and limited financial aid eligibility.
- Encourage university presidents to exert leadership in the area of transfer so that decisions are not left solely to registrars. The transfer frameworks are not being applied uniformly. Also, create more incentives for four-year institutions to accurately track KCTCS transfer students to degree completion.
- Continue to work on developing a Community College Feedback Report to better understand strengths and weaknesses in the transfer pipeline.